

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 16-17 have been amended. New claims 18-19 have been added. Claims 13-15 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-12 and 16-19 are pending in the application.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and safe receipt of the priority document.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to provide antecedence basis for use of the term "multiplex" in the claims. As discussed below, since multiplexing of the digital signatures is illustrated in FIG. 14 and described in the description of FIGS. 12-14, this amendment does not constitute new matter. Further, a typographical error in a reference numeral has been corrected.

Objections to the Specification and Rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter of claim 17 with regards to the limitation "the range of said partial data is multiplexed according to a multiplex of said partial data." Further,

claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, the specification has been amended to provide antecedent basis for use of the word "multiplex", and the Examiner's attention is directed to FIGS. 12-14 and the accompanying description thereof on pages 15-17 of the specification.

FIG. 12 illustrates a digital signature file that includes a first digital signature 1201 in lines 002 to 018 and a second digital signature 1203 in lines 020 to 036. FIG. 14 illustrates a display frame 1401 that includes signature information 1402 that is information relating to the signature analyzing result of the first digital signature 1201, whereby the first digital signature and the second digital signature are multiplexed, i.e., an additional digital signature is applied to data to which a digital signature has been applied. Also, the display frame 1403 denotes the range of the signature object of the second digital signature 1203, and signature information 1404 is information relating to the signature analyzing result of the second digital signature 1203. It may be easily confirmed from the relation of inclusion of the display frames 1401 and 1403 that the range for first digital signature 1201 is the signature for the field represented by the identifier "title" and the data including the second digital signature 1203. Accordingly, FIG. 14 illustrates multiplexing of digital signatures and ranges of a partial data. Further, the newly added claims 18 and 19 are directed to similar subject matter as claim 17, and are also supported by FIGS. 12-14 and the related description.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-12 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,805 - hereafter "Brown"). These rejections are traversed as follows.

Brown does not disclose displaying the content of the signed part and the detected range of the signed part within a display of the total contents of the data. Accordingly, Brown does not teach displaying the content of partial data and the detected range of the partial data on the same screen with the entire data, wherein the range is indicated by a displayed frame around the content, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the "content of the partial data" is content of the digital signature per se, while the detected range of the partial data includes information representing which part of a document is a digital signature object, and which part is not a digital signature object. Brown does not teach detecting the range of the partial data, or displaying the detected range as a frame on a display on which the entire data is displayed. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Brown and the other art of record, taken either singly, or in combination. Independent claim 7 includes a limitation similar to claim 1, and, is therefore allowable over Brown for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-12 and 16-17 depend from claims 1 or 7, and are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Discussion of New Claims 18 and 19

New claims 18 and 19 include the feature that a verification result of multiplexed digital signatures is displayed. Neither Brown, nor any of the other art of record teaches or suggests displaying a verification result of multiplexed digital signatures, i.e., where at least one additional digital signature is applied to data having a first digital signature applied thereto. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 are allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: December 5, 2005